

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 AMARILLO DIVISION

MICHAEL LYNN SMITH,

Petitioner,

v.

NATHANIEL QUARTERMAN, Director,
 Texas Department of Criminal Justice,
 Correctional Institutions Division,

Respondent.

§
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §
 §

2:07-CV-0105

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO DENY
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Petitioner has filed with this Court a petition for a writ of habeas corpus challenging a March 2, 2007 prison disciplinary proceeding. The disciplinary proceeding took place at the Clements Unit in Potter County, Texas. As of the date the instant habeas application was filed, petitioner was still incarcerated at the Clements Unit.

In order to challenge a prison disciplinary adjudication by way of a federal petition for a writ of habeas corpus, a petitioner must, at a minimum, be eligible for mandatory supervised release and have received a punishment sanction which included forfeiture of previously accrued good time credits. *See Malchi v. Thaler*, 211 F.3d 953, 958 (5th Cir. 2000). In his habeas form petition, petitioner advises he is in respondent's custody pursuant to a 2004 conviction for the offense of burglary of a building out of Lamar County, Texas, for which he received a twenty (20) year sentence. In his application, petitioner contends that he is not eligible for mandatory

supervised release. As petitioner is not eligible for mandatory supervised release, he is not entitled to any federal habeas corpus relief.¹

RECOMMENDATION

It is the RECOMMENDATION of the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge to the United States District Judge that the petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed by petitioner MICHAEL LYNN SMITH be DENIED.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE

The United States District Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Report and Recommendation to each party by the most efficient means available.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

ENTERED this 13th day of June 2007.


CLINTON E. AVERITTE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

*** NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT ***

Any party may object to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. In the event a party wishes to object, they are hereby NOTIFIED that the deadline for filing objections is eleven (11) days from the date of filing as indicated by the "entered" date directly above the signature line. Service is complete upon mailing, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(B), or transmission by electronic means, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(D). When service is made by mail or electronic means, three (3) days are added after the prescribed period. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(e).

¹Petitioner has not averred he lost any previously earned good time credits. In fact, petitioner has failed to state what punishment was imposed as a result of the disciplinary proceeding at issue. If petitioner did not lose good time credits he would not be entitled to federal habeas relief. However, because petitioner states he is ineligible for mandatory supervised release, the issue is not necessary to the disposition of this case.

Therefore, any objections must be filed on or before the fourteenth (14th) day after this recommendation is filed as indicated by the “entered” date. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); R. 4(a)(1) of Miscellaneous Order No. 6, as authorized by Local Rule 3.1, Local Rules of the United States District Courts for the Northern District of Texas.

Any such objections shall be made in a written pleading entitled “Objections to the Report and Recommendation.” Objecting parties shall file the written objections with the United States District Clerk and serve a copy of such objections on all other parties. A party’s failure to timely file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation contained in this report shall bar an aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings, legal conclusions, and recommendation set forth by the Magistrate Judge in this report and accepted by the district court. *See Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996); *Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276-77 (5th Cir. 1988).